

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/738,049	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAPLAN, DAVID R.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jacob Cheu	<b>Art Unit</b> 1641	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jacob Cheu.

(2) Mr. Ames.

**Date of Interview:** 23 July 2004

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Mr. Kaplan.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*1 and Declaration filed on July 13, 2004*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Karman et al. J Immu. Method 1999 230: 113*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant indicated that the fluorescinated tyramide in application is a different labeling technique which differs from Karman's, i.e. biotinylated tyramide, but does not contribute to the enhancement of flow cytometry signal. Applicant also pointed out the support of the "equivalent to" (agent) language in the specification page 18 and 24. Applicant also explained the fold-increase from Figure 2-6. .